



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,636	07/15/2003	Hsieh Kun Lee		1706

25859 7590 08/25/2005  
WEI TE CHUNG  
FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE  
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

MCKINNON, TERRELL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3743

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,636

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Terrell L. Mckinnon

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-21 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-21 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Amendment***

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's amendment filed May 25, 2005. Claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-9 and 11-21 are pending and an action on the merits is as follows.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11, 14-17, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien (U.S. 6,655,449) in view of Calaman et al. (U.S. 6,719,039).

Hsien's invention discloses liquid cooled heat dissipating device comprising all of the claimed limitations from above except for the pins being disposed merely around a center portion of the tank; the height of the pins are substantially equal to the height of the sidewalls; and protrusions contact and terminates at the other.

3. However, Calaman teaches a liquid cooling device, wherein the height of the pins (25) is substantially equal to the height of the sidewalls (21).

Art Unit: 3743

Given the teachings of Calaman, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the liquid cooling device of Hsien with the height of the pins is substantially equal to the height of the sidewalls.

Doing so would enhance the support structural of the cooling device and thermal conductivity.

4. Claims 3, 7, 12, 13, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien (U.S. 6,655,449) in view of Calaman et al. (U.S. 6,719,039) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Cutchaw (U.S. 4,612,978).

Hsien's invention, as modified by Calaman, discloses all of the claimed limitations from above except for inlet and the outlet are perpendicularly disposed at least one of the sidewalls of the tank; and the distance between a free end of each of the inner walls and a corresponding opposite sidewall is substantially equal to a distance between any two adjacent inner walls.

5. However, Cutchaw teaches an inlet and the outlet are perpendicularly disposed at least one of the sidewalls of the tank; and the distance between a free end of each of the inner walls and a corresponding opposite sidewall is substantially equal to a distance between any two adjacent inner walls.

Given the teachings of Cutchaw, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the liquid cooled heat dissipating device of Hsien with inlet and the outlet are perpendicularly disposed at least one of the sidewalls of the tank; and the distance between a free end of each of the

Art Unit: 3743

inner walls and a corresponding opposite sidewall is substantially equal to a distance between any two adjacent inner walls.

Doing so would provide an alternate design arrangement to accommodate a given heat-generating configuration.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed May 25, 2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the above-mentioned rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following references cited on the USPTO 892 discloses related limitations of the applicant's claimed and disclosed invention.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3743

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terrell L. Mckinnon whose telephone number is 571-272-4797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennett can be reached on 571-272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Terrell L Mckinnon  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3743  
August 22, 2005